UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/780,863	02/19/2004	Soon Hyung Hong	2236.0010000/JUK/SMW	1952
26111 7590 12/09/2009 STERNE, KESSLER, GOLDSTEIN & FOX P.L.L.C. 1100 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W. WASHINGTON, DC 20005			EXAMINER	
			LAZORCIK, JASON L	
WASHINGTON, DC 20003			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1791	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			12/09/2009	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	10/780,863	HONG ET AL.
Examiner initiated interview duminary	Examiner	Art Unit
	JASON L. LAZORCIK	1791
All Participants:	Status of Application:	_
(1) <u>JASON L. LAZORCIK</u> .	(3)	
(2) Scott M. Woodhouse (Reg. No. 54,747).	(4)	
Date of Interview: 4 December 2009	Time: <u>12:57pm</u>	
Type of Interview:	ant's representative)	
Part I.		
Rejection(s) discussed:		
Claims discussed: Claim 2 and Claim 11		
Prior art documents discussed: US 7,217,311		
Part II.  SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENE See Continuation Sheet	RAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS	S DISCUSSED:
Part III.		
<ul> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.</li> <li>It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summar</li> </ul>	e examiner will provide a writte record of the substance of the	en summary of the substance interview, since the interview
/Jason L Lazorcik/		
Primary Examiner, Art Unit 1791	Applicant/Applicant's Representat	ive Signature – if appropriate)

Application No. 10/780,863

Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: Applicant was advised that the claims in the instant Applicantion read over the prior art of record. Applicant was however advised that claim 2 of the does not appear to further limit the subject matter of independent claim 11 since the recited limitations of claim 2 are presently recited in step (d) of claim 11. Applicant was advised that incorporating the limitations of claim 2 into independent claim 11 step (b) and canceling claim 2 would resolve the outstanding issue with claim 2. Applicant was further advised of the double patenting issues regarding United States patent US 7,217,311.